Petn 20: 1133
dated 13th Augt 1890 from
Jangamkote Srinivas Rao

In March 1881 one Hanu
mantarayappa was appointed
Shanbhog Gumasta of
Jangamkote, Bhadrankere
and other villages. On
13th January 1882 Srini.
vas Rao, Shanbhog of the
above villages stated before
the Devan Lalli Anilou
that he (Shanbhog) may
be granted leave and
Hanumantarayappa
allowed to continue
to do work for him as
Gumasta. This arrange-
ment was sanctioned
by the Bangalore District
Dy Comr on 11.3.82.

Hanumantarayappa
embezzled Govt money
& absconded. The matter
was reported to the Dy Comr
in 1886. The Dy Comr ordered
that the amount embezzled
should be recovered from
the Hakdar Shanbhogs.

Petn for leave
to 20th April 93.

Heard 26th Jan 1893 VR 22/1/92
Grant as
R Ellerton
24/1/1892

The Builder issued a
notice dated 30.11.86
to Srinivasa Rao
as Shanbhog of Jangam-
Kote, Bhadrankere & 4
other villages requiring
him to make good in
all Rs: 797 "11" 1. more
than one notice was
sent to Srinivasa Rao. He
did not make good the
amount - and the matter
formed the subject of cor-
respondence between the
Builder & the Dy Comr.
At last Srinivasa Rao
requested the Dy Comr
to recover the amount
in six annual in-
stalments of Rs 100/ each
and complained also
about Bhadrankere village
having been added to
another village (Hoskote)
during the survey settle-
ment of 1885-86. The
Dy Comr stated that if
Srinivasa Rao paid at once
~~#~~ half the amount due,
time would be granted
till one year for the pay-
ment of the other half.
and that the dispute
about Bhadrankere
having been added on

be passed for the separation of the village from Korkote.

The first petition received from Srinivasa Rau in this office on the subject of the Amalga matter was 1887. The Petition was referred to the Dy Coms & was directed to make the representation through the Dy Com.

A notice was also given by Gundappa dated 8th July 1888 - by the Amildar intimating that the orders had been received from the (District Treasurer) that the Shanbhogi would be registered in the name of the person that keeps paid the Govt. money embezzled by the Shanbhog Ga-mastra

From this notice

This Panchayat appears to stand in the name of Shri Ramdeo.

Gundappa & Subba Rao appear to have come forward because of the above notice.

Subd to Conclusion

Orders

Bhatkal Kere
Jampalli &
other villages (

Sandhi mallaru Agra. 1506

Amt
Jmt. 2
Nadkadi

(20)

Order. As Amani Bhadran -Kere is no longer a separate village having been amal -gamated at the Survey Settlement with the adjacent village of Hospete, the separation of the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere from that of Hospete cannot now be sanctioned. The Hettakki family (represented by the present officiator Gindappa) which is entitled to the Shanbhogi of Hospete to the exclusion of the other branches and to two-thirds share in the Shanbhogi of Bhadran -Kere, will continue to hold the Shanbhogi of the combined new village, and the Petitioner and Mahadevadu of the Desh Kulkarni family will

will be registered as subordinate Haikdars possessing $\frac{1}{3}$ share in the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere (~~of~~ Equivalent to of the Combined village) and allowed a preferential claim to succeed to the office of the combined village when no members of the Hettakki family are forthcoming ~~or to act as Gramcoptas~~ during minority of registered officiators of the Hettakki family. In respect of the Shanbhogi of Jangam-Kote and other villages the arrangements made by the Deputy Comm. Bangalore District in 1874 and 1880, under which the office is now held by Petitioner, a member of the Desikulkarni family, will be maintained

or to officiate according to a system that may be adopted hereafter under such a system

I agree to the Devon's decision — If Devarsa will pay the amount as directed, no difficulty arises — but if he does not pay, the Devan's decision is that Gundappa of Hallaki family should be made to pay the amount & Devarsappa's sub share in Bhadravathi removed — Now I observe that Gundappa does not agree to pay the whole amount, but only that which relates to vrittya no 1 in which he has 2/3ds share. Perhaps he may pay that due on account of vrittya no 2 also as he has in it 1/3d share — but he has no share in all the other 4 vrittyas, & my

mostly accepted 30/3/95 by

We cannot on any
ground whatsoever call
upon Gundabba to pay
the amounts of Revenues.
I would therefore say
that so far as regards
Nos 1 & 2 are concerned,
money may be received
from Gundabba if S Rão
does not pay & has
apportioned exclusively on
Shanbhog — For the other
Crops, if S Rão does not
pay, he must be dismissed,
& any of his colleagues who
are willing to pay the amount
apportioned. — If the Dewan
approves of this, I'll move
the decision accordingly.

VL
21/11/95

(General Serial No. 32.)

1890-91

No. 463

Name of Petitioner. J. Srinivasa Row
Sub Asst Settr, Chupra P.N.D.

Village. Dadja

Taluk. Nagamangala

District. Bea

Date of Arzi. 9th June 90

Date of Receipt. 18-6-90

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil

ABSTRACT.

Complaining that
Dy Comr has not as yet
disposed of his case
regarding the shanbh
ship of Amani Bhadrau
kere, as per Devarus Prop
No 5238-46 Cir 133 dated
8th December 1887, Petr
begs for early orders
to dispose of his case

13.
Submitted, as endorse
ment to Petr in 1887 to represent
the D.C. Comr.
8th July 90. AR

Petr shd apply to Dy Comr
& obtain his Ord. first
Bg 11-7-89
Petr
7-90



No 463 [illegible]
18-6-90

9/14

The Dewan of H. Highness
The Maha Raja of Mysore.

Most Respected Sir

Although your humble petitioner requested the Commr of Kolar district for the past three years in obedience to your honor's endorsement No 3800 dated 5th March 1887, to enquire into the case, regarding the lastanding claims of the chauhoggy of Amany Bhudrkoo, having been set aside by the amalgamation the said Amanykoo to another village during the Revenue Settlement of Siddaghatta Taluk No considered was given to dispose the reference, as per Proceedings the Dewan of Mysore No 5238-46, Cir; 138 dated 6th December 1887, and the Case is allowed to be in the Dy. Commrs office, as is likely, to take few Years more than what it has already taken, for which your humble servant has to suffer the loss of the right for no reason.

Your humble servant therefore requests that the Govern would graciously please, to order for an immediate disposal of the case, or to call for the Records connected with, and decide it as early as possible, to relieve your humble petitioner from the loss faced.

Begs to remain
Most Respected Sir
Your Most obedt & Humble Servant
[illegible]
Sales Overseer Mysore D. R's
Nagamangala Taluk

Camp Badgas
9th June 1890

COURT FEE

12-3-8

EIGHT ANNAS

COURT FEE

12-3-

EIGHT ANNAS

Jeevanrao
Sub Inspector
M. R. Pay.
Mandya.

(General Serial No. 32.)
1890.

No. 1133

Name of Petitioner. J. Srinivasa Row

Village. Sub overseer Nagamangala

Taluk.

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 13th August 90

Date of Receipt. 14th August 90

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Requests the remission of Government Revenue or orders for an immediate disposal of the petitioners claims of Ammanikere

Endorsement by the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar District No 18 of 4th October 188-

Time cannot be allowed as requested Half of the amount should be paid immediately to the Taluk Amildar and if the receipt of the payment be submitted one years time would be allowed for the

payment of the remaining half. Else the late Deputy Commissioner's order will be carried out. There is no connection between the defalcated amount and Assurance Betterments being attached to Hosapalé village by the Survey Settlement.

This must form the subject of a separate [illegible]

No 448

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1133
dated 13th August 1890 received at the
Dewan's Office from J. Srinivasa Rao
Sub-overseer Nagamangala
Mysore District

is forwarded, together with its Two
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District with a request
~~to~~ furnish information
as to petitioner's means
and circumstances
and his present pay.
The whole amount which
petitioner has been
called upon to pay
should also be stated

Drafts as per
W's Orders
22

By Order,
Chief Secretary

BANGALORE,
30th Aug 1890.
3-9-90.

21. Deputy Commissioner's Office

Kolar District

No 2311/543 Re 371 file of N.S.

Dated 6th November 1890

(5)

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

With preference to your Official Memorandum No: 448 of the 30th August last addressed to the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District and forwarded to me by that Officer giving cover to a petition from J. Srinivasa Row, Sub-overseer, Nagamangala on the subject of a demand made by this office for payment of certain revenue collections embezzled by one Hanumantharayappa in his capacity of Shanbhogue Gumasta of the Petitioner for Jinjamkote and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, I have the honor to submit for information and obliging perusal when no longer required the accompanying records received with the Sidlaghatta Amildar's Urzi No: 518 of

of the 14th. ultimo with which has been filed a memo (in English) explaining the circumstances of the case.

The Petitioner is a D.P.W. Sub-overseer in the Mysore District drawing a pay of Rupees 30 per mensem and is reported to own no property in this District except the Inam lands attached to his Shanbhogui Service.

The total amount due by the Petitioner is Rupees 665-a-10

The enclosures of your memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner

I
P. 54 28

(6)

To The Dep^y C Kolar Dist^t

LR 77-89-4

Dr 4564 Dy 20-11-96 & Rec^d
386 P. 640-27

Dy C^rs letter no 2311/543 dy 6th instant
reporting upon the petition
of J. Srinivasa Rau complaining
of his being wrongfully called
upon to pay the amount
embezzled by Shanbhoga
Gunnaiah Hanumanthrayappa of Jangamkote
& other villages
in Srinivaspur
Taluk

With reference to the above
cited subject I am directed to
observe that the Dep^y C^r
report referring to a memo-
randum in the petition
the facts & circ^s & merits
of the case is meagre &
inadequate as the memorandum
does not grapple with the
points adduced by the Petr^r
in his petition both to the
Dep^y C^r & to the Govern^t
himself - The memorandum
is even inaccurate where
it says that the appointment
of the Shanbhoga Gunnaiah
who has embezzled Govt money
was made "at the request
& with the consent in writing"
of the Petr^r - The hypothetical

(General Serial No. 30).

189 .

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

25. (7)

(General Serial No. 31).

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN MYSORE
9529
17 JAN. 91
669

189

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Government of Mysore.

Dated 7th
Despatched 15 } January/91
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file & V.P.

General No. 2903
No. 689 1890—91

Submits report on the petition from J. Chinnaswamy Row complaining of his being called to pay up the embezzled amount by Shanbog Gumasta &c—

Petition Dept
Cr
16/1/91

Submitted.
24/1/91 A.R.

Submitted with a Memo.
26/5/92

133
22-1-91

Amildar's report No: 684 of the 2nd instant).

3. All the subsequent proceedings adopted in the case by my predecessors in office have been based on the same view as expressly recorded by them and I fail to see any good grounds to differ from them.

4. The mere absence of a muchalika such as is preferred to by the Petitioner cannot in any way affect the force of the long established and recognized usage by which the Hakdar Shanbhog is held answerable for the acts of his gumasta.

5. The Petitioner alleges that the property of the absconded gumasta which had been attached in satisfaction of the embezzled money was afterwards released without recovering the full amount due to Government, but it is clear from the Siddaghatta Amildar's Arzi No: 519 of the 14th October last attached to the accompanying file that the whole of the gumasta's property was already sold in satisfaction of the arrears due by him to Government.

6. The records show that some other property

property was also attached as belonging to the Gumasta but subsequently released on complaint by the real owners.

7. The Petitioner's prayer for 6 yearly instalments for payment of the Government demand against him was disallowed by Mr. Abdul Rahman and I cannot well recommend the grant of such a long time to the Petitioner; but would strongly urge that the Petitioner be directed to make good at the risk of forfeiting his hak to the office the embezzled amount within 3 months from the date of order as he has had ample time already.

8. With regard to the Petitioner's objection to the amalgamation of Amani Bhadrankere with the adjoining Hosplete village at the Survey Settlement of the Siddaghatta Taluq which point has however no necessary connection with the case under notice, I beg to submit herewith a file of correspondence ending with the Survey Superintendent's yadi No: 3884 dated the 17th November 1888 on the subject.

9. It will be seen from the same that my predecessor Mr. Abdul Rahman was of opinion that the Amanikere should be allowed

31.

2974 & 5

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 .

No. 2974

Name of Petitioner. Goondappa

Village. Bhadravakeri

Taluk. Siddagatta

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 10-3-91

Date of Receipt. 10-3-91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

AR 77-89-6

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner hears th
Srinivasa Rao
of Jangamakotta
appealed to this Off
requesting for an
permitting him
from the full amount
revenue o

may be so ordered.

He begs to State that though
Deputy Commissioner knows
the petitioner is really the
bogue of Bhadranakeri —
— and Shanbogue of the
he really is (as per Sadar
Diffo Court decree Nos: 12 of 1834) —
yet, he Linciply gives him
petitioner) a notice of
embezzlement, but does
mention what part of
said sum the petitioner
to pay.

In Conclusion he prays
as he is quite willing
pay what ever he has
ly to pay, his Share of the
ment may be made
own to him and that
may be made a party
proceedings of the
Sumeeroosa Ross case).

COURT FEE

2974

Petitioner

2

Respondent

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਸਕੱਤਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ:- ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ. 1/88/88 ਮਿਤੀ 8.7.88 ਅਤੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ. 1/88/88 ਮਿਤੀ 23.5.88 ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਿੱਚ ਵਾਧਾ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ।

ਮੈਨੂੰ ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਲਿਖਣ ਦਾ ਆਦੇਸ਼ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਵਿੱਚ ਵਾਧਾ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ. 1/88/88 ਮਿਤੀ 8.7.88 ਅਤੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ. 1/88/88 ਮਿਤੀ 23.5.88 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਆਦੇਸ਼ਾਂ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਇਹ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿ

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸੁਰਜਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ ੧੮੬੩ ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਪ੍ਰਤਾਪ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ 1842 ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸੁਰਜਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ ੧੮੬੩ ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਪ੍ਰਤਾਪ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ 1842 ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸੁਰਜਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ ੧੮੬੩ ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਪ੍ਰਤਾਪ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁਤ੍ਰ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਸਾਕਿਨ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਅੰਬਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮੌਜਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਗੁਜ਼ਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਫੀ ਸਨ 1842 ਈਸਵੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੈਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਚੁਕੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਉਸ ਦਾ ਵਾਰਸ ਹਾਂ ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਮ ਪਰ ਮਾਫੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਹੋਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਏ ਜੀ.

(14)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 911

Name of Petitioner. J. Sreenivasaiah
Shanbog of Jamani Dibbenkere

Village.

Taluk. Srinivasapura

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 12—10—92

Date of Receipt. 13—10—92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Reminds Bhis several petitions presented during Relast two years on subject of his claim Re Shanbogy of Jamani Dibbenkere,

Sikh
17/10/92

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-9

36.

Submitted to His Council in Confr. BO
22/10/92

Lr 77-89-7

Worthlessness
Circle Surveyor
Srinivasapura
26/10/92

(13)

OFFICE.
RTMENT.
195
TE 14-4-92

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 4306
DATE 18-3-92

Office
14-3-92
Vidyaranyapuram

One Rupee Stamp

Circle
114

Petn Deptt
Nos 18 3 92

ಸನ್ನಿಧಾನದವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸಿಂಹಾಸನಾರೋಹಣ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವದ ಸಂಭ್ರಮವು ಸಮೀಪಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਸਮਾਧ ਦੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਸੜਕ ਦੇ ਪਾਰ ਸਥਿਤ ਹੈ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

ਇਸ ਗੁਰਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਦੀ ਇਮਾਰਤ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਸੰਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਮਸਕੀਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖ-ਰੇਖ ਹੇਠ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਵਿਚ ਸੰਤ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਿੱਖ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਲੂਆਂ ਨੇ ਵੱਡਾ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਸੀ।

-3-

(11)

No 1127
Rep

To



K. Seshadri Iyer Esquire
B.A. B.L. C.S.I.
Dewan Bahadoor of Mysore.
Bangalore.

May it please your Honor

I the undersigned herein beg to bring the following prayers to your Honor's kind consideration.

The hereditary claims of Amani Bhadramadevi of Sidlaghatta Taluq, Kolar District solely belongs to me. And it is a year back that I lodged my appeal, begging therein, not only to pay over the amount embezzled by the Gumasta who was appointed to look over the villages, but also for the Separation of the village from Hoskote the Govt village with which it was unjustly amalgamated in the late Revenue Survey settlement.

I have now come to understand that the Shanbhog of the Govt village Hoskote has in spite of my claims, petitioned to your Honor, agreeing to pay over the embezzled amount, with the intention of setting aside my claims, and thus objecting to the separation of the village from the Amalgamation

I therefore request your Honr to consider over and recognise my proper claims and to kind pass early orders for the separation of the village from the amalgamation as the dela only causes others to avail themselves to defy my claims. And the fact that it is necessary the village should be broken from the Amalgamation, as soon as possible may be observed, as seen in the Report of the Amildar of Sidlaghatta Talug, Submitted to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, which might have been in turn submitted to your Honor along with the Records of the Case Concerned.

For which act of kindness, I feel ever obliged to your Honr

I beg to Remain
your Honr
your Honor's most obedient and humble
Servant

Mysore.
The 23rd Aug: 91.

Bangalore
18-8-91
Vijayadurgamoodi

No. 110, Cantonment
No. 104.
1051

Eight annas stamp affixed.

OFFICE OF THE
DIWAN OF MYSORE
18 AUG. 91

ਸਾਰੇ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਹੋਣ ਨੂੰ ਕਹਿ ਦਿਓ ਤੇ ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਕਹਿ ਦਿਓ ਕਿ ਜੇ ਕੋਈ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਨਾ ਹੋਇਆ ਤਾਂ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਜ਼ਬਤ ਕਰ ਲਈ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ ਤੇ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਭਗੌੜਾ ਸਮਝਿਆ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ ਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਨਾਂ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰ ਦਿਓ ਤੇ

To

49

No 897 Plus 103

Rec'd

OFFICE OF THE
4 AUG 91
DEWAN OF MYSORE

The Dewan to His Highness
The Maha Rajah of Mysore.
Bangalore.

May it please your Honor

I the undersigned herewith beg to submit the following prayers for your Honor's kind Consideration.

The Amani Bhadravakeri village of the Sidlaghatta Taluq has been amalgamated to the adjacent Govt village in the Revenue Survey Settlement in prejudice to my claims of the Shanbhoge, for which, I submitted an appeal to your Honor, a years back, for the separation of the village from the amalgamation but no order, as yet has been granted as to the separation, though it is a long-time back, the records were received by the Deputy Commissioner.

I therefore most respectfully and humbly request your Honor, to be so kind enough as to seperate the village as Early as possible

(15)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 1984

Name of Petitioner. Hettakki Subba Row Hissedar Shanbhog of Bhadrankere Siddapatta Taluk

Village. Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arzi. 2/2/93

Date of Receipt. 3/2/93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner prays that the records connected with the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere may be sent for from the Dy Commrs office and perused, and that the hakdars' right may be protected.

Sd. 4/2.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

25

1984 R

3-2-93

[illegible]

54.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 2407

Name of Petitioner. Mahadevarao Deshmukhkarni

Village. Jangamkoti

Taluk. Sidlaghatta

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. —

Date of Receipt. 16-3-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

ABSTRACT.

States that the fish in the hukeras for the Shanbhoga of the Amtane Bhadrana- -kere; it has a revenue of Rs 300; it has been during the Survey Settlement unfairly attached to the Hosapeta without the petitioners consent. prays that it may be separated into a & hereby appointed separate charge - The present Shanbhoga Gundappa who alleges himself to be hukeras is the present [illegible] as per civil court [illegible] When this was [illegible] father & uncle [illegible]

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

Re Estate Robt Ruth-
One Spinning Mill has
preferred a Claim before
Re Govt, & it is posted
for hearing ... Please mark
the Notice may be
given Dr Ruth also
for appearance &
Assert his Claim
Claim

20/3/193

(18)

Petition No 1133 of 1890-

Petitioner-	Counter Petitioners
Jamjamkote	1. Gundappa
Srinivasa Rao	2. Soobbaw
~~Shanbhog of~~	3. Mahadeva Rao
~~Bhadrana~~	
~~Kon~~ Sidlaghatta	
~~Lodak~~.	

10-7-90

The Shanbhog Gumasta of Bhadrankere, Jamjamkote and other villages, named Hanumantarayappa, having misappropriated Government money and absconded, the deputy Commissioner ordered that the amount embezzled, Rupees 797-11-1, be recovered from the Hakdar Shanbhogs. The Amildar issued a notice in that behalf to Petitioner Srinivasa Rao, as the Hakdar Shanbhog of the said villages, whereupon he made application, praying for permission to pay the amount by annual instalments of Rs. 100 each and complaining of Bhadrankere having been amalgamated with the village of Hospete at the Survey Settlement. The Deputy Commissioner stated that the dispute concerning the amalgamation of Bhadrankere had no reference to the case of embezzlement and that if Petitioner paid at once ~~one~~ half

the amount referred to, one years time would be allowed for payment of the other half. Petr has appealed against that order

The 1st Counter-Petitioner Gundappa urges that he has two out of three shares in the Office of Shanbhag of Bhadrankere, that the Petitioner has no right to the said Office, that the Survey Department restored Bhadrankere to the position which it formerly held, by amalgamating it with Hospete, a neighbouring village appertaining to his hak, and that he, in preference to the Petitioner should be allowed to pay the portion of the embezzled amount chargeable to Bhadrankere

The 2nd Counter Petitioner Soobba Naiken states that he is also a sharer in the Shanbhogy of Bhadrankere and that at the Survey settlement Bhadrankere was added to Hospete at the request of himself & other sharers. He prays that such arrangement may be made as will respect the rights of all the sharers.

The 3rd Counter Petitioner Mahadevachar states that the Office in question belongs to his hak and that the other parties have no right to it. He urges, like the Petitioner, that the amalgamation of Bhadrankere with Hospete was wrong

From the Petitions addressed by the parties and the representations made by them at the hearing,

6 en

20 Copies
12-5-93

No: 1133-4304-
2974-2407

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

12-5-1893 (17)

1. Jayarankote Srinivasaka Hettakki
2. Subbappa residing at Jayarankote
3 Hettakki Subbakka at Kottige Bangalore
4 Deskulkarni Mahadevaka of Jayarankote

Endorsement granted to X

(1) 1133 & 13-8-90 & 9118 & 1240/92 subsequent papers 8971 & 31-7-91, 2912 & 3823-8-91 & X (enter No of each paper)

(2) 2974, 1051, 1230 dated 16-3-91; 18-8-91; 14-4-92 & 1984 & 16-3-93 & X-93

(3) 4304 & 16-3-93

(4) 2407 & 16-3-93

in reply to his Petition Registered No. X dated X

in the matter of the liability to pay the amount embezzled by Gumasta Hanumantarayappa & of the right of the several Sharers to the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere.

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ requested the Dr Commr of Kolar has been requested to summon before him the several sharers to the office of Shanbhog in question of Bhadrankere and after enquiry to record the share of the Hulk which belongs to each Branch of their ~~original Shanbhogi~~ family in ~~Sooties~~ each village comprised in the entire group belonging to the family & to decide the manner in which the various branches should enjoy the office as regards every village included in the entire group, and to apportion among the Naikpars of the various villages the revenue of which was embezzled by Hanumantarayappa, the amount which each has to pay towards making good the embezzled amount

To whom instructions have been issued to hold an Enquiry and to dispose of the matter in dispute between the several shanbhogs

5/5/93

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Draft

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. 18845

From The Dy Commissioner Kolar Dist

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 16th June
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. 1 + record

General No. 4656
No. 1129 1893-94.

In reply to Chief Secy's memo: No. 18531 dated 5th May 93

SUBJECT. Pet. 288-94

Submits report regarding petition of Bhandarakere and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Talluk &c.

Note 23.6.94

Rec'd 23/6

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Submitted Pet. 288-94

The petn was heard by the Dewan and the Judicial Councillor. Directions were given and the Dy Commr was asked to dispose of the case or to apply for the instructions of Govt. The Dy Commr applies for instructions.

V.P. 30/6

The Rev. Councillor directed today that this should be submitted to the Judl Councillor

V. J 2/9/94

Better report the case by 1st

5/9/94

Posted 27 Sept under five notice to the parties

28/6/94

Notices issued

7/9/94.

64.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,
Dated 16th June 1894.

No 4655/1129

From

The Deputy Commissioner, (19)
Kolar District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No: 18581 dated 5th May 1893 Pet: 7288-92 giving cover to copy of Government decision of the same date regarding the Shanbhogship of Bhadrankere and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, I have the honor to state that from the records and accounts available on the subject it appears that since the year 1839-40 the members of the Deshakulakarni family have been the officiating Shanbhogs of Bhadrankere though those of the Hettakki family are also shewn amongst the Hukdars.

2. The Barabalute register of 1864 shews that Jangamkote Gundappa of the Deshakulakarni family was at the time the Shanbhog of the Taluk and that the duties of the office were performed by a

Gumasta appointed by him.

3- The right of the said Gundappah to the Office having subsequently been questioned by Mahadeva Row (3rd Counter-petitioner) who claimed the post for himself, the matter formed the subject of enquiry by the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, who, after obtaining the consent of all the members of the Hettakki and Deshakula-Karni families with the exception of Mahadeva Row whose objection was set aside on the ground of his being a very small sharer in the link, seems to have by an order dated 11th February 1874 directed the continuance of Gundappa as the Registered Shanbhog of Bhadrankere and other villag

4- About one year and nine months after this decision, Gundappah was dismissed from the Shanbhogi by an order of the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. Richetts No: 463 dated 5th November 1875 for having committed certain irregularities in connection with the Batayi produce and that Officer directed that a competent person unconnected with the family of the dismissed Shanbhog should

in the Shanbhogi - He states that if he be appointed to the post, he will make good the whole of the embezzled money so far as it relates to the taluk -

12 - Govindappah (No: 2) uncle of Hettakki Gunda-ppah did not appear for examination -

13 - Hettakki So[illegible] proses that whether or not an amalgamation of Bhadravathi with Hospete village remains undisturbed all the members of the Hettakki and Deshakulakarni families be permitted to officiate as Shanbhogs by rotation for periods proportionate to their respective shares in the inam and is in that event willing to make good his own share of the Government money embezzled by Gumasta Hammantrayappa -

14 - He adds that during his term he will have the duties performed by a Gumasta as he holds a Government employment elsewhere -

15 - Ramappa (No: 4) is a minor. His guardian Nanjundayya has addressed a petition signifying his consent to Hettakki Gundappa (No: 1) being appointed Shanbhogue on condition of his receiving $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the potgi and allowing the remaining $\frac{2}{3}$rds to be distributed between the other shares after defraying thereout the assessment due to Government on the service

inam lands - He proposes that the amalgamation of Bhadrankere with Hospete village should stand undisturbed and he offers to make good the minor's share of the embezzled money.

16- Narasingappah (No 55) was not examined as he did not appear.

17- Hettahki Seetaramappah (No: 6) wishes that he may be allowed an officiating tura according to his share whether the Bhadrankere remains attached to Hospete village or not and he offers to make good the whole of the embezzled money relating to the taluk if the Shanbhogi be registered in his name.

18- Beramachanahalli Narasappah (No: 7) has addressed a petition expressing himself in favor of the appointment of Gyndappah as Shanbhog on condition of the latter being allowed a portion of the potagi and the remainder being distributed between the other sharers after defraying thereout the Government dues on the service inam lands attached to the office. He proposes that the amalgamation of the taluk with Hospete village should remain undisturbed and offers to make good his share of the embezzled money.

as specified below:- 72

No	Name of Sharer	No: of shares owned by him
1	Hettakki Gundappah	1
2	Hettakki Seetharamappah	1
3	Peramachanahalli Narasappah	1
4	Narasappa son of Venkatappah	1
		4

27- Gundappah (No=1) has been discharging the duties of the Shanbhogi of this village since the death of his father Vasudevappah who held the office during his lifetime and he is also doing the duties connected with Bhadrankere which has been amalgamated with the said village - Vasudevappah is stated to have died 7 or 8 years ago-

28- Seetaramappah (No=2) states that Gundappa has since the death of his father withheld the payment of the miras be= due to the other share-holders and has been appropriating to himself the whole of the protgi assigned to the office. He requests that he may be registered as the Shanbhog of the village or allowed an officiating turn in proportion to his share in the land.

29- Peramachanahalli Narasappa No:3 has addressed a petition to the effect that Hettakki Gundappa may hold the Shanbhogship of Hospete receiving a portion of the protgi and allowing the remainder to be

distributed between the other shareholders.

30- Narasappah son of Venkamappah (NB: 4) has given a kyfiet to a similar effect-

31- The Shanbhogi of Jangamkote is devided into 3 shares of which 1 is held by the Hettakki family, 1 by the Deshakulakarni family and the 3rd- by the Kasaba family. Jangamkote

32- Deshakulakarni Srinivasa Row is the present Shanbhog of Jangamkote which is one of the 6 villages he was appointed to in 1880 under Mr. Ricketts order referred to above and he continues to have the duties performed by his Gymasta.

33- Hettakki Gyndappa Shanbhog of Hospete, states that he has no objection to Srinivasa Row continuing as the Shanbhog of Kasaba Jangamkote provided he performs the duties himself and is willing to take only $\frac{1}{3}$rd- of the Inam attached to the service giving the remaining $\frac{2}{3}$rds to be distributed among the other hissedars.

34- Hettakki Subba Row desires that the shareholder appointed to officiate as Shanbhog should be required to pay up the entire Inam attaching to the office for the benefit of a Siva's temple founded by his ancestors at Jangamkote or if that cannot be done that all the shareholders should be allowed

preferred to seem to have opposed the nomination and there would probably have been no agitation on the part of these claimants of Bhadrauere had been allowed to remain independent and Srinivasa Row had not in consequence of its amalgamation with the adjoining Hospete Village objected to pay up the Government money embezzled by his Gumasta

42- As Srinivasa Row legally succeeded to the office so far back as 1880 by virtue of his appoint-ment to the same by a Competent authority and as there are no good grounds to cancel such appoint-ment, it would seem undesirable to deprive him of his vested right to the Shanbhogship of any of the villages comprised in his charge.

43- He is willing to make good the Government money embezzled by his Gumasta paying half of it forthwith and the remainder within a year's time. If the Government consider that this concession cannot be granted owing to his having gained much time during the course of the correspondence on the subject, he may be called upon to pay up the whole of the amount at once and also to perform the duties himself instead of through a Gumasta as heretofore.

44- Looking to the individuality of the interest involved in the Shanbhogi of Hospete which is shared in by the members of only one family (the Hettakki family) while that of Bhadravathi is divided between the members of both the Hettakki and the Desha-Kulakarni families, it would seem convenient to separate the taluk from the village and restore the former to the independent position which it held before the Survey Settlement - There is also a great disparity between the revenue of the taluk and that of the village which appears to be less than $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the former -

45- If the above arrangement be considered impracticable, I would submit as an alternative proposal that the Shanbhog of Bhadravathi be regarded as the Head and that of Hospete as the Deputy Shanbhog, the former keeping some of the accounts of the taluk and the latter the remainder, each receiving a proportionate share of the profits -

46- Hettakki Gundappa may continue to be one of the Shanbhogs.

47- The original proceedings as per

accompanying fairist bearing on the Subject to which is attached an English Statement shewing briefly the results of the examination of each claimant in the case are herewith submitted for preference and obliging return when no longer required -

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

Encl -

890

being registered as subordinate Hakdars as indicated above in the case of Hospete.

2. The embezzlement having taken place when Bhadravati Kore was in the charge of Petitioner, Sreenivasa Row's Sannidha; the full amount embezzled should be recovered from Petitioner in two instalments i.e. half now and the other half six months hence. Should he fail to make these payments, the mis appropriated amount so far as it relates to Bhadravatikere and Jangamkote may be received from Gundappa of the Hettakki family who offers to pay the same, and he appointed exclusively as Shanbhog of these villages. If Sreenivasa Row does not pay the amount relating to the other four villages, he must be dismissed, and any of the collaterals willing to

This is the modified form of the first draft as suggested by Mr Chystal Row & approved by Dewan (vide Dewan's Remark on first draft) HK

29/4/95

pay the amount appointed 8/-

By Order
HH
29/4/95
Off/Chief Secy

22412

Copy forwarded to the Dy Comm. Kolar, Returning the records + sent by parcel. Dated 8/6/95
received with his letter No 4656 dated 6 June 94
1129

Miss Saunders
Deputy Commissioner
& Mr Chemical
Rare & Co
Dear Madam
Yours
received
6.5.95

By order
HH 29/4/95
Chief Secretary

Secretary
6/5/95

P 7 288-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

LR 57-83.
" 32-76

Later references.

LR 153-95.

1889-90

192 .

(LR)

File No. 77-8

Serial Nos. 1-13

P-84

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-13

In Part B for February 1893

SUBJECT.

Complaint of J. Sreenivasa Rao Sub-Overseer, Mysore P.W.D. Nafanagala Taluk, regarding the Shanbhogi of Amani Bhadravakere —

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

No 18581. Dt. 28. 2. 1893.
P.7. 288-92.

Instructing him to dispose of the matters in dispute between several shareholders regarding the Shanbhogi of Bhadravakere and of the liability to pay the amount embezzled by Venkata Hanumantappa. —

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed
HK

& Portsote during the survey
settlement had no reference
to the case of embezzle-
ment.

Against this order of
the Dy Comr (dated 4th
October 1888) srinivas
Rao submitted Petn no. 1133
dated 13 Augt 1890 to this
Office.

Further information
was called for & report
no. 2903/689 was last recd
from the Dy Comr: in Jan
1891.

The Dy Comr is not
in favour of granting any
instalments, and as
regards the amalgama-
tion of Bhadravati Kere
complained of he suggests
that work may be car-
ried on by turns.

& Madiah urges that Govt. be
directed to make good at
the risk of forfeiting his
claim to the office the embezzle-
ment within 2 months
from the date of order as he
has had ample time already

as noted by the Secretary

When correspondence
was going on about
one Gundappa &
the following G.O.

No.
2974 of
1051 &

and subsequently - one Subbarao 4
sent in Petition -
No. 4304 dated 16th:
March 1892.

Gundappa alleges that
Bhadrankere belongs
to him as Hakdar
Shanbhog, that he
may be required to
make good the embezzled
money proportionately
for Bhadrankere - &
that he may be made
a party in suit vs
Revis case.

Subbarao represents
that he is also a Hissedar
of the Shanbhogi office
of Bhadrankere - & that
he may be given a
portion of the emoluments.

Petn No: 1127 - Recd
in Augt 91 from
Shivarbasa.
Petitioner represents
that he holds under stands that
till one year of Harkote
ment of the embezzled
and that he in view to
about Bhadrappa's claims
having been Bhadrankere,
orders may

7.

Petn No 1133 of 1890-91

20.4.93.

Petr Jangamkote Srinivasacha
in person -

Cr Petn 1. Subba Rau - in person
2. Gundappa. by Mr L. Srinivasaiya
3 Mahadevappa

Notice Issued
18/4

Resp[t] for Embezzlement & Forgery

Srinivasa Rau

Jangamkotta

Bhandakavi
Jangamkotta

Bella
Byrasandra

1

2

(Pandu's
Petn

Petn —



Sanctioned a Rec. represents
Jangamkotta Branch

Report D.C. for
Enquiry

do.

(General Serial No. 31.)

(5)

OFFICE OF THE
764.2
14.NOV.90
541
DEWAN OF MYSORE.

1890

Submitted
11/90 AR

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 6th
Despatched 8 } November
Received

Enclosures No. 341 file of V.P.

General No. 2311
No. 543 } 1890-91.

Submits report on the petition of J. Srinivasa Row, Sub Overseer, Nagamangla on the subject of a demand for payment of certain revenue collections embezzled by one Hanumantharayappah, Shanboge Gumasta of the petitioner for Jangamkota and other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluq.

Petitioner may be informed
11/11/90

133
17-11-90

2

2Lr.

Upon shows that Dy[r] only
~~Suggested the Extension~~
of the Jamaica Company for
Extension of lease on the
Substitute whom the local
Officers of Govt had already
Appointed on their own responsibility
2 Under these Circs a
further & full report
is required by Govt on the
various points adduced
in the Petitions above
mentioned - with the
Dy/r Mr Madrāsi's own
opinion on the merits
of the case & his recom-
mendations if any -
Report shd also be made
of the steps taken to recover
the embezzled money
from the firm & at
himself.

3 The file is herewith
Ret[d] for needful & re-
turn soon as the
Report called for
is made

Sd/-
20/11/96

the subject with which had been filed a Memo
(in English) explaining the circumstances of the case.

2. With respect to your observation that the
Memorandum is meagre and inaccurate, I
beg respectfully to submit that the Petitioner's
contention that the Gumasta was not appointed
on his (Petitioner's) responsibility cannot prevail.

Whatever may have been the circumstances
under which Hanumantarayappa was appointed Gumasta
by the Taluq authorities for which no reference is
available the Petitioner in his statement dated the 13th
January 1882 before the Devanhalli Amildar
requested in unequivocable terms that the said
Gumasta might continue to officiate for him
during his absence in the Gold Mines and that he
would remunerate him for such period. From
this it must be inferred that the Gumasta's
appointment from the date of the Kaifiyet above
referred to should be regarded in the light of
a new appointment. The embezzlement of moneys
collected by the Shanbhog's Gumasta prefers to
the period subsequent to his new appointment
above adverted to, and the Petitioner must therefore
be held responsible for the same (Vide Amildar's

to remain distinct from Hoosplete as before or if such an arrangement were found impracticable, the Shanbhog of the Tank might be appointed the Head and that of Hoosplete the Deputy Shanbhog of the village as newly constituted but the Survey Superintendent who does not Concur in the above proposal, thinks that the duties Connected with the village may be performed by the two Shanbhogs by rotation to which the parties Concerned do not consent.

10. I would therefore beg to recommend that the arrangement made during the Survey Settlement may under the circumstances be enforced each Shanbhogue performing the duties of the office for a period in proportion to the revenue of each village.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

A Mundy

Deputy Commissioner

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਵਿਭਾਗਾਂ ਦੇ ਮੁਖੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਤੇ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਲਈ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ।

MYSORE REVENUE DEPARTMENT
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. No. 2407
DATE 16-3-93

I

II

III

there appear to be three branches of sharers viz^z Hettakki, Jangam-kote, and Cuda or Appaji, divided from each other, and enjoying different shares, each in some of the villages which originally belonged to the family. The 1st & 2nd Counter Petitioners who belong to the Hettakki branch claim 2 shares in the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere. The 3rd Petr who belongs to the Jangamkote branch claims a share therein (~~but this right is disputed by the others, and the 3rd counter Petr asserts that the entire office belongs to him.~~)

So as regards the Jangamkote Village are is said to belong to the three branches named.

To ascertain which of the rival claims should pay the amount embezzled and in what proportions, it is necessary to investigate into and adjudicate on the claims set up. There appears to be no difficulty in recovering the amount, the parties being ready to pay when the share due by each is determined.

The Deputy Commissioner is therefore requested to summon before him the several sharers to the office and after enquiry to ~~decide as early as practicable which of the sharers have a right to~~ the Shanbhogy of Bhadrankere in what manner & would enjoy the office in what proportions to

and the Share of the
ch which belongs to.
the Branch in Each Village &
decide the manner in
ich the various branches shd
. the other Villages
which the Hold Enjoy the
illages of the three Offices as
ranches
. Regards Enjoy
Village included
in the entire Grants

~~decision of the Dy Comr~~ Dy Comr will proceed to apportion among the Mukadam of the Villages, the revenue of which has been embezzled by Hanmanta Yaqupa, the amount which each has to pay towards making good the embezzled amount. The D.C may, if need be, apply for the instructions of Government on any of the questions referred to, submitting a full report of the facts elicited.

~~by the petitioner made by the~~

The petitions received from both parties will be forwarded to the Dy Comr.

18581
Pet F. 288-92

28/4/93

Mr 6/5
for Chf. Secy.

To. The Dy. Comr. Kolaba DL with Petns & Vernacular Trans

~~Scratched~~
11/5/93.

into the same.

9. The Hettakki family has two-thirds share and the Deshaknlakarni family one third in the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere. 67 Bhadra

10. The two shares owned by the 1st mentioned family are subdivided into 12 parts as particularized in the subjoined table.

No.	Name of Sharer	No: of shares allotted to him.	The proportion the shares be to the whole
1	Hettakki Lyndappa (The 1st counter		
2	Govindappa (Uncle) —petitioner		
3	Hettakki Soob Row — (The 2nd — do —)	1	1/18
4	Ramappa (a minor)		
5	Narasingappa	4	2/9
6	Hettakki Seetaramappah (Brother)	4	2/9
7	Peramachanahalli Narasappa		
8	Soorappah (Brother)	1	1/18
9	Hettakki Narasappah		
10	Naranappah (Brother)	1	1/18
11	Soobbannah (Brother)		
		1	1/18
		12	2/3

11- Hettakki Lyndappa (No: 1) Shanbhog of Hospete has been performing the duties of Shanbhog of Bhadrankere since its amalgamation with that village at the Survey Settlement. He wishes to be the Shanbhog of both the village and the tank and offers to give 2/3 rds of the Jodgi amount to be distributed among all the other sharers

19- Soorappah (No=8) neither appeared in person nor communicated his wishes by a petition.

20- Hettakki Narasappah (No=9) states that he has no objection to Hettakki Gundappah being appointed Shanbhogue of Bhadravathi on condition of the latter receiving $\frac{1}{2}$ the pot-gi amount and allowing the remaining half to be distributed between the other sharers. He is also in favor of an alternative order for all the shares officiating by rotation each of them appropriating to himself the full pot-gi during his turn. He proposes that the amalgamation of Bhadravathi with Hospete should stand and offers to make good his share of the embezzled money.

21- Naranappah (No=10) and Soobbamah (No=11) did not appear nor have they intimated their wishes by a petition

22- No information could be obtained as to any Sub division of the one third share which the Deshakulakarni family has in the Shanbhogi of Bhadravathi. The only members who represented the family during the enquiry are (1) Jangambhote Srinivasa Row (the petitioner) and (2) Malladeva Row (the 3rd counter-petitioner).

23- The first named prays that Bhadrankere may be separated from the adjoining Hospete village and restored to the independent position which it held prior to the Survey Settlement and that the Shanbhogship of the tank may be continued to him - He promises to pay up the embezzled money by two equal instalments, the 1st forthwith and the 2nd within a year - He is also willing to perform the duties of the office himself instead of through a Gumasta as heretofore if so directed by Government.

24- He complains that the accounts connected with Bhadrankere were taken away from his Gumasta and handed over to Hettakki Gundappa, Shanbhog of Hospete subsequent to the amalgamation of the tank with that village.

25- Madhadeva Row contends that he is the sole hukdar for the shanbhogship of Bhadrankere and wishes that it may be conferred upon him or on his 3rd son Ranga Row - He requests that Bhadrankere may be separated from Hospete village with which it has been amalgamated and expresses his willingness to pay up the embezzled money if so directed by Government.

26- The Shanbhogi of Hospete village vests exclusively in the Hettakki family and has been divided into 4 shares Hospete

to officiate by rotation each receiving the full profit during his own turn.

Jangi

35- Hettakki Narasappah states that he has no objection to Srinivasarow, the present registered Shanbhog of Jangamkote continuing in office if the latter will give up ½ the profit to be distributed between the other shareholders.

36- Peramachanahalli Narasappah of the Hettakki family desires that the duties of Shanbhog of Jangamkote should be performed personally by one of the shareholders instead of through a Gumasta and that the officiator should only receive a portion of the profit allowing the remainder to be distributed between the other shareholders.

37- Nanjundiah guardian of Ramappa (a minor of the Hettakki family has addressed a petition to a similar effect.

38- Vobalappa who represents the Kasaba family wishes that Srinivasarow the present Shanbhog of Jangamkote should be required to give up the profit to be distributed between the subject-holders or each of the shareholders the whole of the officiate by rotation receiving to perform the duties on his turn. He is willing to pay a Gumasta as heretofore the embezzled money which

39- A review of the foregoing Will shew that the terms proposed by the several shareholders are varied and complicating and such as cannot be accepted in the interests of the public service which requires that the officiating Shanbhog should be paid the full amount of the profit attaching to his office - He cannot without seriously lessening his responsibilities be called upon to pay any portion of his remuneration to the hissedars whose only right is to the enjoyment of their respective shares in the inam lands originally assigned for the service nor is it possible or convenient to allow rotation among so many shares

40- The contending parties are evidently trying to revive stale claims which were long ago set at rest by the confirmation with the consent of all the shareholders of Deshahulakarni Gundappah in the Shanbhogship of Bhadrauhere Jangamkote and other villages in 1874 under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District to [illegible] the villages in question belonged at the time appointed required said Gundappa having since been removed office for the reasons explained above, his cousin Srinivas by his ancestors) the present registered Shanbhog was be done that all duties when none of the claimants